

Remarks

This Amendment and Response is considered fully responsive to the 17 March 2009 Final Office Action. Claims 1-7, 12-33 and 38-52 were pending in the application. Claims 1-7, 12-33 and 38-52 stand rejected in the 17 March 2009 Final Office Action. In the following Response, claims 1, 27, and 50 are amended, no claims are canceled and no claims are added. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 27, and 50 is provided in paragraphs [0047] through [0050] of the published application. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments. Claims 1-7, 12-33 and 38-52 are now pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration are requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Sheu in view of Kneipp and Meisel

The Final Office Action has rejected claims 1-3, 6, 12-14, 22-25, 27-29, 32, 38, 39, 45-48 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,099,301 to Hueymin Sheu (hereinafter “Sheu”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,102,970 to Paul Kneipp (hereinafter “Kneipp”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,197,640 to William S. Meisel (hereinafter “Meisel”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 27, and 50, from which claims 2-7, 12-33 and 38-49 depend, have been amended to recite “an alphanumeric termination cause code generated by the call mediator indicating a reason the communication was disconnected,” or a similar limitation. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the originally filed application. *See, e.g.*, paragraphs [0047] through [0050] of the published application. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner admits that the Sheu reference fails to teach the following: (1) recording an alphanumeric such a termination cause code; (2) translating the alphanumeric termination cause code into a numeric termination cause code; and (3) wherein translating the alphanumeric termination cause code is performed by an enterprise gatekeeper. *See* page 2 of the Office action.

The Examiner, however, argues that the “alphanumeric termination code” of Kneipp teaches the recited “alphanumeric termination *cause* code.”

The alphanumeric termination code of Kneipp is entered by a call center agent in response to the end of a call. *See, e.g.*, column 4, lines 37-47. Examples of the termination codes contemplated by Kneipp include a “no answer” or “yes sale.” *See* Figure 6A. The code is not generated by a call mediator as recited in amended independent claims 1, 27, and 50. Thus, Kneipp fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “an alphanumeric termination cause code generated by the call mediator indicating a reason the communication was disconnected.

None of the Sheu, Kneipp, or Meisel references teach or suggest at least such an alphanumeric termination cause generated by the call mediator indicating a reason the communication was disconnected. Thus, claims 1, 27, and 50 as well as claims 2-7, 12-33 and 38-49 that depend from claims 1, 27, and 50 are not obvious over Sheu in view of Kneipp and in further view of Meisel. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-7, 12-33 and 38-50 and allow claims 1-7, 12-33 and 38-50.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Sheu in view of Kneipp and Meisel and Galloway

The Final Office Action has rejected claims 4, 5, 7, 30, 31 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over Sheu in view of Kneipp and Meisel and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,430,709 to James R. Galloway (hereinafter “Galloway”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 4, 5, 7, 30, 31, and 33 depend from claims 1 and 27 and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 27. Further, Applicant believes that Galloway fails to overcome at least the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Sheu, Kneipp, and Meisel. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 4, 5, 7, 30, 31 and 33 and allow claims 4, 5, 7, 30, 31 and 33.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Sheu in view of Kneipp and Meisel and Kwan

The Final Office Action has rejected claims 15 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over Sheu in view of Kneipp and Meisel and further in view of U.S.

Publication No. 2004/0255154 to Kwan et al. (hereinafter “Kwan”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 15 and 40 depend from claims 1 and 27 and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 27. Further, Applicant believes that Galloway fails to overcome at least the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Sheu, Kneipp, and Meisel. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 15 and 40 and allow claims 15 and 40.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Sheu in view of Justice and Kwan

The Final Office Action has rejected claims 16 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over Sheu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,056 to Justice et al. (hereinafter “Justice”) and further in view of Kwan. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 16 and 41 depend from claims 51 and 52 and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed below with respect to claims 51 and 52. Further, Applicant believes that Justice fails to overcome at least the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Sheu and Kwan. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 16 and 41 and allow claims 16 and 41.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Sheu in view of Justice

The Final Office Action has rejected claims 17, 20, 21, 44, 51 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over Sheu in view of Justice. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 51, from which claims 17, 20, and 21 depend, recites that information associated with a communication is recorded at a call mediator and that the information associated with the communication recorded at the call mediator is parsed to create an authentication record.

Claim 52, from which claim 44 depends, similarly recites a call mediator that records information associated with a communication and an enterprise gateway that is programmed to create an authentication record by parsing the information associated with the communication.

The Justice reference discloses a customer service center that includes a database 40. The database 40 typically includes a variety of interrelated database records corresponding to transactions processed by the customer service center. The database 40 contains customer account records (including a telephone number) and information on an order history related to each customer account. *See* column 4, line 24-52. A database record for a new customer is created by a customer service representative (CSR) that requests and receives information from a customer, enters the information into an order entry program, and saves the information in the database 40. *See* column 8, lines 10-18.

The Examiner argues that the Justice reference discloses “information associated with [a] phone number is used to create an authentication record” referring to Figure 11 of the Justice reference. *See* paragraph 7 on page 11 of the Office action. Applicant respectfully points out that this is different from what is recited in claims 51 and 52.

First, claim 51 recites that the information associated with the communication that is recorded at a call mediator is parsed to create an authentication record. Claim 52 has similar limitations. The database record disclosed in the Justice reference, however, includes a telephone number that is not related to a communication, but rather is information related to a customer.

Second, the Justice reference discloses a database 40 that is created by a customer service representative. The information in the customer information screen 350 shown in Figure 11 of the Justice reference is created by a customer service representative (CSR) and not by parsing information associated with a communication recorded at a call mediator.

Even if one were to combine the Justice reference with the Sheu reference (which Applicant maintains would be improper), the combination proposed by the Examiner fails to disclose at least these limitations recited in claims 51 and 52 and their dependent claims. Thus, claims 17, 20, 21, 44, 51 and 52 are not obvious over the Sheu reference in view of the Justice reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 17, 20, 21, 44, 51 and 52 and allow claims 17, 20, 21, 44, 51 and 52.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Sheu in view of Kneipp, Meisel, Kwan and Justice

The Final Office Action has rejected claims 18, 19, 42 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over Sheu in view of Kneipp and Meisel and Kwan as applied to claims 15 and 40 above, and further in view of Justice. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 18, 19, 42, and 43 depend from claims 1 and 27 and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 27. Further, Applicant believes that Kwan fails to overcome at least the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Sheu, Kneipp, and Meisel. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 18, 19, 42, and 43 and allow claims 18, 19, 42, and 43.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Sheu in view of Kneipp, and Meisel and Devine

The Final Office Action has rejected claims 26 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over Sheu in view of Kneipp and Meisel and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,376 to Devine et al. (hereinafter “Devine”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 26 and 49 depend from claims 1 and 27 and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 27. Further, Applicant believes that Devine fails to overcome at least the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Sheu, Kneipp, and Meisel. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 26 and 49 and allow claims 26 and 49.

Request for Continued Examination

This Amendment and Response is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination and the required fee. Applicant believes no other fee or petition is necessary with this Amendment and Response. Should any other fees or petitions be required, please consider this a request therefor and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3199 as necessary.

Conclusion

Claims 1-7, 12-33 and 38-52 are currently pending in the application. Applicants have fully responded to each and every objection and rejection in the Final Office Action dated 17 March 2009 and believe that claims 1-7, 12-33 and 38-52 are in a condition for allowance. Applicant therefore requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If the Examiner should require any additional information or believes any issues could be resolved via a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

June 17, 2009

/Thomas J. Osborne, Jr./

Date: _____

Thomas J. Osborne, Jr.
Thomas J. Osborne, Jr., Reg. No. 39,796
USPTO Customer No. 83579

HENSLEY KIM & HOLZER, LLC
1660 Lincoln Street, Suite 3050
Denver, Colorado 80264
Tel: 720-377-0709
Fax: 720-377-0777

TJO/sbm